

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

Attached is one sheet of Replacement Sheet, along with one sheet of Marked Up Drawing Sheet.

REMARKS

The present claim amendments are responsive to the Examiner's concerns noted in the Office Action.

Summary of the Response

The specification has been amended. Fig. 1 has been amended. Claims 1 and 6 have been amended. New claims 9-20 have been added. Claims 1-20 remain pending in this application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the present application as amended are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC 102

Claims 1 and 3-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kubo et al. (US Patent No. 6,124,919). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The specification and claim 1 have been amended to correct an obvious typographical error, which misidentified the optical light scattering film as an "optional" light scattering film. All the disclosed embodiment support this amendment, as the optical light scattering film is clearly shown in the figures (see, layer 6 in Figs. 4 to 7).

Claim 1 requires the front optical stack to consist essentially of a polarizer and an optical light scattering film. In accordance with the present invention, the front optical stack does not include a compensation plate (such as a retardation plate). Kubo instead discloses the combination of a light diffusing plate 15, upper polarizing plate 11 and an upper retardation plate 10. Accordingly, Kubo does not anticipate claim 1.

New claim 9 further recites that the front optical stack consists only the polarizer and the optical light scattering film, and new claim 10 further recites that the front optical stack does not include a compensation film. These claims further clarify the distinguishing structure of the present invention.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC 103

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubo et al. (US Patent No. 6,124,919). Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubo et al. (US Patent No. 6,124,919) in view of Saiki et al. (US Patent No. 6,697,132). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Given the traversal of claim 1, the dependent claims 2 and 8 are likewise patentable over Kubo, either taken alone or in combination with Saiki. These dependent claims contain limitations that further distinguish from the cited references. Saiki does not make up for the deficiencies of Kubo. There is no suggestion to combine Kubo and Saiki in the first place.

New Claims

New claims 9-20 have been added to round out the coverage of the present invention. These new claims do not add new matter and fully supported by the original specification. The claims are patentable over Kubo, taken alone or in combination with Saiki, for the same reasons given above.

For example, new claim 20 recites a single compensation film supported by the second substrate, without compensation supported by the first substrate, in combination with the other

recited layers. Such structure is clearly not disclosed in Kubo, which requires a retardation layers on both the upper and lower substrates.

CONCLUSION

In view of all the foregoing, Applicant submits that the claims pending in this application are patentable over the references of record and are in condition for allowance. Such action at an early date is earnestly solicited. **The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned representative to discuss any outstanding issues that may not have been adequately addressed in this response.**

Respectfully submitted,


Dated: May 7, 2007




Wen Liu
Registration No. 32,822

LIU & LIU
444 S. Flower Street; Suite 1750
Los Angeles, California 90071
Telephone: (213) 830-5743
Facsimile: (213) 830-5741
Email: wliu@liulaw.com


Attachments: Replacement Sheet
Marked-Up Drawing Sheet



(Prior art) Fig. 1



(Prior art) Fig. 2



(Prior art) Fig. 3